

2.00 P.M.

I have received a number of notices of adjournment motions. First I will take up the one given notice of by Sri Bangarappa. I request him to state what he has to say in the matter. The hon'ble member must be brief.

**ADJOURNMENT MOTION re: ARREST OF Sri S. GOPALA GOWDA
IN CONNECTION WITH "VIDHANA SOUDHA CHALO".**

† ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಬಂಗಾರಪ್ಪ (ಸೊರಬ).—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ರೂಲ್ 50 ರ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಈ ಅಡ್ವರ್ನ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಮೋಷನ್ ಕಳಿಸಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ದಿನಾಂಕ 26-6-1967ನೇ ದಿನ ವಿಧಾನ ಸೌಧ ಚಲೋ ಚಳವಳಿ ಸಂಬಂಧದಲ್ಲಿ ಅನೇಕರನ್ನು ದಸ್ತಗಿರಿ ಮಾಡಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಭೆಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರಾದ ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಗೋಪಾಲಗೌಡ ಶಾಂತವೇರಿಯವರು ಸಹ ನನ್ನ ದಸ್ತಗಿರಿಯಾಗಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈ ವಿಷಯ ಈ ಸದನಕ್ಕೂ ಹಾಗೂ ಹೊರಗೂ ಸಹ ಸಂಬಂಧವಿದೆ. ಇದು ತೀವ್ರವಾದುದು ಅಲ್ಲದೆ ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕ ರಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ವಿಷಯವಾಗಿದೆ. ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ಪ್ರಮಾಣದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕರ ಗಮನ ಗಳಿಸಿಕೊಂಡಿದೆ. ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಗೋಪಾಲಗೌಡರು ಈ ಸದನದ ಸದಸ್ಯರಾಗಿದ್ದಾರೆ. "ವಿಧಾನ ಸೌಧ ಚಲೋ", ಚಳವಳಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಭಾಗವಹಿಸುವ ಹಕ್ಕನ್ನು ಪಡೆದಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈ ಸದನದಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರು ಹಾಜರು ಇರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅಡ್ಡಿ ಆತಂಕ ಬರುವ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸರಕಾರದ ವತಿಯಿಂದ ಅವರ ದಸ್ತಗಿರಿಯಾಗಿದೆ. ಇಷ್ಟೇ ಅಲ್ಲದೆ ಪ್ರತಿನಿತ್ಯದ ಜನ ಜೀವನ ನಡೆಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಹೋಗುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಪ್ರತಿಬಂಧಕಾಜ್ಞೆ ಮುಂದುವರಿಸಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಈ ವಿಷಯ ತೀವ್ರ ಸ್ವರೂಪದ್ದಾಗಿದೆ. ಅದುದರಿಂದ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು ಈ ಅಡ್ವರ್ನ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಮೋಷನ್‌ಗೆ ಒಪ್ಪಿಗೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಅದನ್ನು ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಟ್ಟು ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕರ ತೊಂದರೆ ಸರಕಾರ ಕಳಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವಂತೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಇದಲ್ಲದೆ ಸಭೆ ಮೆರವಣಿಗೆಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಪ್ರತಿಬಂಧಕಾಜ್ಞೆಯನ್ನು ಕೂಡಲೇ ತೆಗೆದುಹಾಕಬೇಕು. ಮತ್ತು ಜನರಿಗೆ ತಿಳುವಳಿಕೆ ಉಂಟು ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಈ ಹಿನ್ನೆಲೆ ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡು ಈ ಅಡ್ವರ್ನ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಮೋಷನ್ ಮುಖ್ಯ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೇನೆ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Would the hon'ble Minister like to state anything with regard to the arrests that have been mentioned? In fact it was mentioned in this House that a statement was made in the other House, that no statement was made here, there was scant courtesy shown, that this House is entitled to a certain amount of respect at the hands of the Minister, &c. That was the observation made yesterday and I do not know whether any statement was made there at all. I have read only in the papers.

Sri M. V. RAMA RAO (Minister for Home and Labour).—No statement was made in the House. But before disallowing the notice of adjournment motion which had been tabled in the Legislative Council the Chair called upon me with a view to inform itself of the views of the Government before deciding on the admissibility of the adjournment motion and the Chair called upon me to speak. I stated what I have stated on the floor of the other House. In this House I was present here from 1 P.M. until 2.15 P.M. Before I left the House the adjournment motions that had been tabled here were read out from the Chair and disallowed. I was not called upon by the Chair and I had no particular desire myself to volunteer to make any statement. If any hon'ble

(SRI M. V. RAMA RAO)

member of the House had desired that I should speak, I should have had no objection. There is no question of showing any discourtesy either to the House or to any member. If the Chair had called upon me here before deciding the admissibility of the motion on adjournment I would have stated my views in the usual course.

Mr. SPEAKER.—In that case the hon. Minister may kindly do it. If there is any statement to make or any information to be given to the House, the hon. Minister may please do it.

Sri M. V. RAMA RAO.—Is it with regard to the arrests?

Mr. SPEAKER.—Yes.

Sri M. V. RAMA RAO.—In regard to the arrests that have been made, action has been taken under the law to deal with persons who have contravened the law and have committed offences under the existing law and they have been produced before the Court and orders have been made by the court remanding them to judicial custody. Further steps to prosecute the persons who have contravened the law will be taken in due course. Beyond that I cannot say anything. The fact that some persons happen to be members of the legislature can make no difference. The law does not make any exception in the case of members of the legislature. Because I happen to be a member of the Legislative Council I cannot lead a crowd when there is an order under section 35 prohibiting the assembling or marching of persons. No member has any immunity from the applicability of the law, the ordinary law of the land. That is all I would like to state.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA (Harihar).—I only want one clarification from the Minister. I am not at this stage contemplating any discussion or debate on the subject.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I think the hon. member can wait a little for the reason that there are four motions dealing with this situation. If any clarification is asked, it means that there is a motion or some item brought before this House. Unless I admit the adjournment motion there cannot be any debate or any clarification. When the debate takes place, clarification and all that will come in. If there is anything other than this subject the member can ask me.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—I am not asking for clarification.

Mr. SPEAKER.—From what I read to the House a little while ago, the matter has gone to the court and is *sub judice*. When I have received a communication and when the matter arises, I will try to deal with it as it arises. I have dealt with the matters so far as the adjournment motion is concerned. There was a similar adjournment motion yesterday and I disallowed it. There is nothing new by way of any additional reasoning or nothing new that has happened after that which will make me change the reasoning. The reasoning on which I disallowed the adjournment motion yesterday was that all the

matters sought to be raised under it could be touched in the course of the debate on the budget. Now that situation has not changed. So, as there is an opportunity to raise these matters on the general discussion of the budget, I do not want to adjourn this business in order to create an opportunity to discuss only the limited point covered by this adjournment motion. Therefore, I am disallowing this adjournment motion.

SRI K. H. PATIL (Gadag).—There is lot of difference between yesterday's and today's motions.

MR. SPEAKER.—After the ruling is given, if the Hon'ble Member says something, it will be a reflection upon the Chair's ruling.

Now, what has the Hon'ble Member Sri K. H. Ranganath to say about his yesterday's privilege motion?

SRI K. H. RANGANATH (Mudigere).—I have read the note given by the Chair and I have gone through May's Parliamentary Practice also. The members Sri M. S. Krishnan and Sri T. R. Shamanna were arrested on 23rd June 1967. On that day there was nothing to warrant their arrest. The contemplated march was fixed for 26th June 1967. I do not know what prompted the Government to arrest the Hon'ble Members of this august House.

MR. SPEAKER.—Let him please state that this is the privilege, these are the limits of privilege and they have been violated. Privilege is confined only to civil matters; it does not arise when there is a criminal matter.

SRI K. H. RANGANATH.—On page 69 of May's Parliamentary Practice it is stated:

“Finally, because the parliamentary privilege is always associated with the service of the House, it is limited to a period comprised by the duration of the session, together with a convenient and reasonable time before and after the meeting of Parliament. This convenient and reasonable time has generally been taken to be forty days before and after a session of Parliament.”

MR. SPEAKER.—The question of period does not arise when the question of 'nature' arises.

SRI K. H. RANGANATH.—The Government's intention in arresting these members was not *bona fide*. They are taking advantage of the existing laws to prevent some members from participating in the discussion of this august House. The Government knew that the House would meet on 26th June 1967 and they also knew that they were prominent members of the City of Bangalore. The procession was organised by the Pura Samithi and especially by the citizens of Bangalore only and the Government have deliberately with *mala fide* intention prevented the Hon'ble Members of this House from participating in the discussion of the House. Thus, there is a breach of privilege.

Mr. SPEAKER.—There is a distinction between civil and criminal processes. The privilege was explicitly held not to apply to cases of persons guilty of treason, felony and breach of peace.

Sri K. H. RANGANATH.—They were arrested on 23rd June 1967 when there was nothing in the city. Breach of peace was not at all there.

Mr. SPEAKER.—In this connection, I wish to quote a paragraph from 'Madras Legislative Information—Vol. II Nos. 1 to 5, March to November 1960':

"Freedom from arrest of Members of Parliament is essentially claimed in order that Members may do service to the State. It has never been claimed that that privilege should allow Members to commit a felony or other offence and escape by privilege of Parliament. In the United Kingdom arrest in civil cases is privileged. This is because a Member of Parliament will be in the House on the business of the State and therefore he should not be removed from the House on any private or individual ground. Arrest for action arising out of criminal jurisdiction are not privileged. Criminal Jurisdiction is the business of the State. It involves considerations of public safety and therefore Criminal Jurisdiction is not covered by parliamentary privilege. In the United Kingdom both the punitive arrest and preventive arrests have been held to be cases falling under criminal jurisdiction, and hence no privilege is attached to the same. In India also in the Deshpande case it has been held that no privilege can be claimed for preventive arrests also."

I may inform the Member that this particular matter which arose in the Madras Legislative Assembly related to the arrest under section 151 of the Criminal Procedure Code. I shall read it further :

"In connection with the strike of the Central Government employees which commenced from the midnight of 11th/12th July 1960, Sri M. Kalyanasundaram, a Member of the Madras Legislative Assembly, was arrested by the Commissioner of Police, Madras, at 4-30 P.M. on the 13th July 1960 while he was in his room at the Legislators' Hostel, Mount Road, Madras, under section 151, Criminal Procedure Code, and was released from custody on the 18th July 1960."

All these points have been dealt with. Unless I am told that this reasoning does not apply and that we must have a new ruling, this ruling stands.

Sri K. H. PATIL.—A question of privilege of the House is to be decided by the House and not by the Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I have not decided it, but I must give my consent for raising it. If I do not give my consent, how can it be raised?

Sri K. H. PATIL.—That is covered by rule 182.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I am not unaware of it and that is why I said that I am not deciding it. But before the matter is allowed to be raised, I must be satisfied that there is a *prima facie* case. Then when I allow the matter to be raised, the House will decide whether it should be referred to the Privileges Committee or the House itself will deal with it then and there. Please do not think that I have not gathered the little knowledge that is wanted. There are different stages to a question of breach of privilege coming before the House. If the member will kindly see that, he will be more than satisfied.

Then I have to say that the Minister for Parliamentary Affairs was pleased to say that if it was the desire of the House there would be no objection to referring it to the Privileges Committee.

Sri S. R. KANTHI (Minister for Law).—What I said was “if the Chair feels that there is a *prima facie* case.”

Mr. SPEAKER.—I do not think there is any *prima facie* case.

ಶ್ರೀ ವಾಚಾಪ್ ನಾಗರಾಜ್ (ಚಿಕ್ಕಪೇಟೆ).—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ತಮ್ಮಲ್ಲಿ ನಾನೊಂದು ಮೆಮೊ ರ್ಯಾಂಡಂ ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಿದ್ದೆ. 26ನೆ ತಾರೀಖು ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ಪೌರಸಮಿತಿಯವರು ವಿಧಾನಸೌಧ ಜಲೋಗಿ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟಂತೆ ಶಾಂತಿಯುತವಾದ ಒಂದು ಪ್ರದರ್ಶನ ಏರ್ಪಡಿಸಿದ್ದರು. ಆಗ 5 ಸಾವಿರ ಜನ ಪೊಲೀಸರನ್ನು ಎಲ್ಲ ಕಡೆ ಹಾಕಿ ಜನತೆಗೆ ಭಯವುಂಟಾಗುವಂತೆ ಗೃಹನಿವಾರಿ ಒಂದು ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿಯನ್ನುಂಟುಮಾಡಿದರು. ಅಷ್ಟು ಜನ ಪೊಲೀಸರನ್ನು ಈ ಕೆಲಸಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಹಾಕಿ ಬೇಕಾದ ಅವಶ್ಯಕತೆ ಇರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಅವರು ಪೊಲೀಸರ ಅಧೀನದಲ್ಲರುವಂತೆ ತೋರುತ್ತದೆ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—What is it? The hon. member Sri Vatal Nagaraj wanted to mention the matter, that is all. Today I have also got a Calling Attention Notice. I will consider whether I should admit it or not. The Minister will kindly take note of this. I suppose a copy has been given to the Minister.

Sri M. V. RAMA RAO.—I got a copy of it at 12 O'clock, today. We can have it tomorrow. I have no objection.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Then there are two more matters. I have to look into them further before I can allow them. One is a letter which was addressed yesterday and given to the Deputy Speaker when I was not present. I am just looking into that.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—This letter that we gave to the Deputy Speaker is a matter about which we have given sufficient notice and on which the entire House is very much agitated. We would request you kindly to take it up today itself.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I have to gather facts before I can deal with it and I want some little time for that.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—I said that this is a matter about which we are all feeling very intensely. The Government have to make the position very clear without any delay. Is it your intention to take it up only tomorrow? I earnestly appeal to you to allow it to be taken up today itself.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I have to gather facts and then I will give supreme importance and top priority for dealing with it. Unless I get the full facts, I will not be able to deal with it.

Sri S. SIVAPPA (Sravanabelgola).—About the letter that we have written to you.....

Mr. SPEAKER.—I do not want to delay it even by a minute. If possible, I will allow it today itself.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಶಿವಪ್ಪ.—ಈ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಮೊದಲು ನಿರ್ಧಾರ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳದಿದ್ದರೆ ಸಭೆಯ ಕಾರ್ಯಕಲಾಪಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಭಾಗವಹಿಸಲು ತೊಂದರೆಯಾಗುತ್ತದೆ, ಬಹಳ ಕಳವಳವುಂಟಾಗಿದೆ, ಇದನ್ನು ನಿರ್ದಿಷ್ಟವಾಗಿ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದೇನೆ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಯಾವ ರೂಲಿನ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಈ ವಿಷಯ ತಿಳಿಸಿದ್ದೀರಿ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಹೇಳಿ, ಸಮಾಧಾನ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಮಾತ್ರ ಕಾಗದ ಬರೆದಿದ್ದಾರೆ, ಪೋಲೀಸರ ಕಾವಲಿರುವುದನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಹಾಕದಿದ್ದರೆ ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಕಾರ್ಯಕಲಾಪಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಭಾಗವಹಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ತಿಳಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಪೋಲೀಸರ ಉಸ್ತುವಾರಿ ತೆಗೆಯುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ನನಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಿಲ್ಲ. ಯಾವ ದಾದರೂ ಒಂದು ತೀರ್ಮಾನ ಮಾಡುವುದರೊಳಗೆ ಹೀಗೆಲ್ಲಾ ಮಾತನಾಡಿದರೆ ಹೇಗೆ ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಕೆ. ರಾಜಯ್ಯಶೆಟ್ಟಿ (ಚಿಕ್ಕನಾಯಕನಹಳ್ಳಿ).—ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿಯೇನಿದೆ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ತರಬೇಕಾದ್ದು ನಮ್ಮ ಕರ್ತವ್ಯ, ಅದರಂತೆ ತಂದಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಹಾಗೆ ಮಾಡದೆ ಹೇಗೆ ಕೇಳಬೇಕು ?

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—If any specific rule is not there, I would earnestly submit to you that after all we are not slaves to rules ; the rules are there to help us, to subserve our interests. There is a residuary rule which covers cases of this nature.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I would like to gather facts first and so I said I will take it up a little later.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—Yesterday when this matter was raised the Minister for Parliamentary Affairs was present. Copy of this letter was also sent to Government and if it is still said that there was no time to consider about it, then we feel that the matter has been deliberately ignored by the Treasury Benches.

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—I protest against the statement made by the hon'ble member. It is not the Government which is objecting to anything. We have left it entirely to you, to apply the rule relevant to the subject.

(Several members stood up simultaneously).

Mr. SPEAKER.—One at a time please.

Sri AZEEZ SAIT (Narasimharaja).—Unless I get up and catch the eye of the Chair, how are you to know that I want to say something? For that I have to stand.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The hon'ble member Sri Azeez Sait not only catches my eye but even my nose, but that does not mean that I should call upon him at once.

Yesterday I took infinite pains to say that if there is anything any member could come and meet me. At that time this hon'ble member was not present.

Sri AZEEZ SAIT.—I was present ; ನಾವು ಹೇಳುವುದನ್ನು ತಾವು ಸಮಾಧಾನ ದಿಂದ ಕೇಳಿ ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಂಡು ನಂತರ ತಾವು ಏನು ಬೇಕಾದರೂ ಅರ್ಜಿಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಡಬಹುದು. ತಮಗೆ ನಮ್ಮ ಕಷ್ಟ ಸುಖ ಹೇಳದೆ ಇನ್ನಾರಿಗೆ ಹೇಳಬೇಕು ?

Mr. SPEAKER.—Even without my calling upon him this hon'ble member has chosen to speak and chosen to treat the House and the Chair in a manner which is not at all commendable.

Sri AZEEZ SAIT.—No, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER.—When I am on my legs he should not speak. He seems to think that he can get up and begin to talk at any time. If the hon'ble member cannot correct himself I will appeal to the Leader of the Opposition if he thinks that this member belongs to his Party, to advise him or else I will have to deal with him myself.

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—I appeal to you when questions of this magnitude come up when the whole City is under police fire and the police is dancing in every street. When such extraordinary circumstances arise, the Speaker should be a little patient and hear what the members say. This is a situation which naturally invokes one's patience and I request you to be patient. After all, you are the custodian of this House and to whom else are we to look, if not to you, for protecting our rights ?

Sri H. SIDDHAVEERAPPA.—The Hon'ble Home Minister has very clearly stated 'ನೀವು ಬೆಂಕಿ ಹಚ್ಚಿದ್ದೀರಿ' if I have heard him correctly. Is he prepared to substantiate that statement ?

2-30 P.M.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ವಿ. ರಾಮರಾವ್.—ಎಲ್ಲರೂ ಉರಿಯುವುದು ನಿಮಗೆ ಕಾಣಿಸುತ್ತಾ ಇದೆಯೇ ?

(Many members stood up)

Sri S. CHANNIAH.—A point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The members will kindly resume their seats. ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಚನ್ನಯ್ಯನವರ ಪಾಯಿಂಟ್ ಆಫ್ ಆರ್ಡರ್ ಏನು ?

† ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಚನ್ನಯ್ಯ.—“ನಿನ್ನೆ ದಿವಸ ಬೆಂಕಿ ಹಚ್ಚಿದವರು ತಾವು”, ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ಹೋಂ ಮಿನಿಸ್ಟರವರು ಭಾಷಣ ಮಾಡಿದನಮ್ಮ ಈ ಲೆಜಿಸ್ಲೇಚರ್ಗೆ ಬಹಳ ಅವಮಾನ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಸ್ಪೀಕರ್ ಆಗಿ ತಾವು ಇರತಕ್ಕ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಲೆಜಿಸ್ಲೇಚರ್‌ನ ಮಾನ ಕಾಪಾಡುವುದು ತಮ್ಮ ಭಾರ ಆಗಿದೆ. ತಲೆ ಒಡೆಯುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಕಾದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದರು ಎಂದು ಅವರು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಯಾರ ತಲೆ ಒಡೆಯುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಯಾರು ಕಾದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದರು ? ಅವರನ್ನು ರಿಪ್ಲೇಸ್ ಮಾಡಿ. ಆ ಸ್ಥಾನದಲ್ಲಿರ ಬೇಕೆಂದು ಇರುವವರು ಅವರೇ ಹೊರತು ನಾವಲ್ಲ. ನಾನೂ ಎಷ್ಟೋ ದಿವಸದಿಂದ ಅವರನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಅವರಲ್ಲಿ ನಮಗೂ ಕೂಡ ತುಂಬಾ ಗೌರವ ಇದೆ. ನಾನೂ ಕೂಡ ಶಾಂತಿಯಿಂದ ಇರಬೇಕೆಂದು ಇಚ್ಛಿಸುತ್ತಾ ನಿಮಿಷ ಭಾಷಣ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೇನೆ, ಹಾಗಿರುವಾಗ ಅವರು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದು ಯಾರ ತಲೆ ಒಡೆಯುವುದು ? ಸ್ವೇಚ್ಛೆಯಾಗಿದ್ದು ಕೊಂಡು ಲೆಜಿಸ್ಲೇಚರ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಭಾಗವಹಿಸುತ್ತಾ ಇರುವವರ ವಿಷಯ ದಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರು ಆ ಮಾತು ಆಡಬಾರದು. ಈಗ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಆಪೀಲು ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಾ ಇದ್ದೇನೆ. ಅವರು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದು ಪತ್ರಿಕೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಬಂದಿದೆ, ಮೇಲ್ಮನೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರು ಮಾಡಿದ ಭಾಷಣವನ್ನು ಪತ್ರಿಕೆ ಯಲ್ಲಿ ಬಂದಿರುವುದನ್ನು ವೇರಿಫೈ ಮಾಡಿ ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತಾ ಇದ್ದೇನೆ, ಇದು ತುಂಬಾ ಅವಮಾನಕರ ವಾದದ್ದು. ಈ ಮನೆಯ ಗೌರವವನ್ನು ತಾವು ಕಾಪಾಡಬೇಕು ಇಲ್ಲದೇ ಇದ್ದ ಪಕ್ಷದಲ್ಲಿ ಮುಂದೆ ಏನು ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ನಾವು ಯೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಸಿದ್ದವೀರಪ್ಪ.—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಆಗಲೇ ಈ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಕ್ಲಾರಿಫಿಕೇಷನ್ ನೀಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಕೇಳುವಾಗ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಿದಾಗ ಆ ಮನೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅಲ್ಲಿನ ಸಭಾಪತಿಗಳು ಕೇಳಿದ್ದಕ್ಕೆ ಅದು ಸ್ಟೇಟ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಅಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಅವರು ಹೇಳಿದರು.

ಸ್ಟೇಟ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಆಗಿಯೋ ಅಥವಾ ಬೇರೆ ರೂಪದಲ್ಲಿಯೋ ಹೇರ್ಟ್‌ಸ್ಟ್ಯಾಟಿಂಗ್ ಆಗಿ ಹೇಳಿದರೋ ಅಂತೂ ಪತ್ರಿಕೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದಿವ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ನಮಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟದ್ದು ಮಾತ್ರ ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಅವರು ಏನು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಎಂದರೆ, ಶಾಸನಸಭಾ ಸದಸ್ಯರುಗಳು ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಹಕಾರಿಯಾಗಿದ್ದಾರೆ, ಅವರ ಉದ್ದೇಶಗಳು ಸಾಮಾಹಿಕ, ಮುಖ್ಯಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳ ತರ ಬುರುಡೆಯನ್ನು ಒಡೆಯಬೇಕೆಂಬುದೂ ಒಂದು ಉದ್ದೇಶವಾಗಿತ್ತು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ನಾನು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಂಡಿರುವ ಹಾಗೆ ಈ ಫೇರಾವೊ ಅನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ಪೌರ ಸಮಿತಿಯವರು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದು ಒಂದೂ ನಮಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ, ನಾವು ನಮ್ಮ ಪಾರ್ಟಿಯಿಂದಲೂ ಅದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಮಾತನಾಡಿಲ್ಲ. ಬಹುಶಃ ಪೌರಸಮಿತಿಯವರ ಕಡೆಯವರು ಮಾತನಾಡಿದ ತಕ್ಕವರು ಬೆಂಗಳೂರಿನ 15 ಲಕ್ಷ ಜನರ ಮನಸ್ಸಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಏನು ಕುದಿಯುತ್ತಾ ಇದೆ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಹೇಳಿರಬಹುದು. ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವರು ಈಗ ನೀವು ಬೆಂಕಿ ಹಚ್ಚಿದ್ದೀರಿ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆ. ನಾವು ಬೆಂಕಿ ಹಚ್ಚುವ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಹೋಗಿಲ್ಲ, ಅರಿಸುವ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೂ ಹೋಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಇವತ್ತಿನ ದಿವಸ ಅವರ ತರಬುರುಡೆ ಒಡೆಯಬೇಕೆಂಬ ಮನಲತ್ತು ಇದ್ದರೆ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಕಾನೂನಿನ ಪ್ರೊಟೆಕ್ಷನ್ ಬೇಕಾದಷ್ಟು ಇತ್ತು, ಐ.ಪಿ.ಸಿ.ನಲ್ಲಿ ಅದನ್ನು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಕ್ರಿಮಿನಲ್ ಪ್ರೊಸೀಜರ್ ಕೋಡ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಕ್ಷಿ ರುಜುವಾತು ಇದ್ದರೆ ಅದನ್ನು ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಅವರು ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕಿಂತ ಮುಂಚೆ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ತಕ್ಕ ಬಂದೋಬಸ್ತು ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಬೇಕಾದಷ್ಟು ಅವಕಾಶವಿತ್ತು. ಕಾನೂನು ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಏನು ಬೇಕಾದರೂ ಕಾರ್ಯಕ್ರಮ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬಹುದಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಐ.ಪಿ.ಸಿ. 120 (ಬಿ) ಏನು ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಅವರು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಕಾನೂನು ಪಂಡಿತರಾಗಿ ಏನು ಮಾಡಬೇಕೋ ಅದನ್ನು ಮಾಡಬಹುದಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಅದನ್ನು ಬಿಟ್ಟು ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಭಯೋತ್ಪಾದನೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಭಯೋತ್ಪಾದನೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಎನ್ನುವಂತಹ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಮಾಡಿದಂತಹ ಈ ಕಾರ್ಯವಲ್ಲ...

Mr. SPEAKER.—Is it a Point of Order ?

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—I am only asking for a clarification, and he may answer. If I have another opportunity to speak on this, I will sit down.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I do not promise anything ; the hon'ble member may please come to a close in two minutes. I will have to deal with the Point of Order.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—Now the point is, we want a clarification from the Hon'ble Home Minister whether he did make a statement casting aspersions or insinuations against the members of the Legislature that they have entered into a complicity in the effort to break the head of the Chief Minister. He did make a statement insinuating against the members of the Legislature. Is he prepared to substantiate what he said ?

Mr. SPEAKER.—I am dealing with the Point of Order. I must deal with it in a consistent manner. Hon'ble member Sri S. Channaiah has raised a Point of Order. In that he raised several things. Before I decide all other things, that relate also to a letter with regard to the existence of the Police or Police being posted or Police officers found on duty within the Legislators' Home, Sudarshana Guest House and the Government General Hostel, I would like to know whether anybody has been put there on duty ?

Sri M. V. RAMA RAO.—In pursuance of letter No. MSL. 9967 dated 6th June 1957 from the Mysore Legislature Special Duty Officer, three uniformed Police Constables and two Police constables in mufti

dress have been posted at each of the buildings, Legislators' Home, Sudarshana Guest House and the General Hostel to guard the buildings and also the property contained therein. In addition to the police staff mentioned, at the Legislators' Home a staff of one Head Constable and four Constables, has also been posted to control the entry of unauthorised persons into the Legislators' Home and its premises with reference to Secretary, Mysore Legislature, letter No. 8321/LA dated 24th June 1967. Further, in view of the troubled conditions prevailing on 26th June, a staff of one Head Constable and two Constables were detailed for duty to maintain law and order on that day only.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I must have some information before I deal with this matter. The responsibility has been put on me that the Speaker has neglected to protect the interests of the members and the privileges of the members. It is perfectly usual, whenever the sessions start, to write to Government, particularly to the Home Department, asking for necessary assistance on their part. This happens not only here, but in all other Legislatures. If one looks to the printed standing instructions, it is made clear to take necessary assistance to check out the people who enter this Legislature building and the Assembly Chamber and the precincts of the Legislature. There is no person who can come here without my permission or without calling upon me. The people posted by the Home Department will be under our control to help in the maintenance of the regular order and all that. That is happening all these years. Now it is mentioned to me that a large number of police people are posted. I do not know how many people were there. I have got a report with regard to this. So far as the Legislators's Home is concerned it is under my direct control. I will read the report.

(Some Hon'ble members of the Opposition interrupted and obstructed to read the report).

Comments may be made after I finish my reading. I have received a report from the Legislators' Home, I have received a report from the Sudharshana Guest House and also from the General Hostel. The gist of the Reports is that during the Session, it is usual to post Police staff to Legislators' Home, Sudharshana Guest House, and also to General Hostel. Police *Bandobast* has been made as usual in the abovementioned buildings from 26th June. This is the report that I have received. It is mentioned that a large number of police staff has been posted. So many people might have been posted in some other places which I do not think I can control.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—It is within the precincts of the building. What has been stated is a patent lie.

Mr. SPEAKER. The word 'lie' is unparliamentary.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—It is a Parliamentary word. I have got a quotation to prove that the word 'lie' is parliamentary. I will just refer to what has happened in the British Parliament. A statement was made on 8th June by George Brown, Foreign Secretary. He has

(SRI H. SINDAVEERAPPA)

stated this in connection with the affairs of Israel and Arabs conflict. The Foreign Secretary Mr. George Brown, told the House of Commons that Cairo Radio had continued to broadcast the "Downright lie" and added: "I repeat that this is a lie". It is not only did not happen, but it could not have happened, as they well know..." Therefore the word 'lie' used is perfectly parliamentary. We can use it.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I have told the House what my impression was. The Hon'ble member tries to interpret about the word 'Lie'. I consider this and deal with it after the Tea break.

†ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಎಂ. ಚನ್ನಬಸಪ್ಪ (ಪಿರಿಯಾಪಟ್ಟಣ).—ನಾನು ಮಾತನಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದಿದ್ದ ವಿಷಯ ಮತ್ತು ಈಗ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರ ಕಡೆಗೇನು ಒಂದು ಪತ್ರ ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಶಿವಪ್ಪನವರಿಂದಲೂ ಮತ್ತು ಇತ್ತ ಕಡೆಯ ನಡಸ್ಯರಿಂದಲೂ ಹೋಗಿ ಅವರ ಹಸ್ತಗತವಾಗಿದೆಯೋ ಅವುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ನಮೂದಿಸಿರತಕ್ಕ ವಿಷಯ ನಮ್ಮ ಶಾಸನಸಭಾ ನಡವಳಿಕೆ ಹಾಗೂ ಸಾಂಪ್ರದಾಯಿಕ ತತ್ವಗಳಿಗೆಲ್ಲಾ ತೀರಾ ವಿರುದ್ಧವಾಗಿದೆ. ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರ ಕೋರಿಕೆಯ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಸಾಂಪ್ರದಾಯಿಕವಾಗಿ ಕೆಲವು ಜನ ಪೋಲೀಸರನ್ನು ಈ ಅಧಿವೇಶನ ಕಾಲಕ್ಕೆ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಹಾಕತಕ್ಕದ್ದು ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರ ಕರ್ತವ್ಯ. ಸಂಪ್ರದಾಯಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟಂತೆ ಇಷ್ಟು ಮಾತ್ರ ಅರ್ಥವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಈ ಸಂಪ್ರದಾಯಕ್ಕೆ ಮೀರಿ ತಮ್ಮ, ಅಂದರೆ, ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರ ಪರವಾನಿಗೆಯಿಲ್ಲದೆ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಜನ ಪೋಲೀಸರನ್ನು ಹಾಕತಕ್ಕದ್ದು ಕಾನೂನುಗೂ ವಿರುದ್ಧವಾದ್ದು ಮತ್ತು ಸಂಪ್ರದಾಯಕ್ಕೂ ವಿರುದ್ಧವಾದ್ದು. ಹೀಗೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಜನ ಪೋಲೀಸರನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಹಾಕಿರತಕ್ಕದ್ದು ರೂಲ್ ಕಾನೂನುಗಳಿಗೆ ವಿರುದ್ಧವಾದ್ದು ಎಂದು ತಾವು ಹೇಗೆ ಹೇಳುತ್ತೀರಿ ಎಂದು ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು ನನ್ನನ್ನು ಪ್ರಶ್ನಿಸಿ ಮಾಡಿದರು. ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ನಾನು ಹೇಳತಕ್ಕದ್ದು ಇಷ್ಟೆ! ಎಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವ ವಿಚಾರ ಗಳಿಗೆ ನಿರ್ದಿಷ್ಟವಾದ ಕಾನೂನುಗಳಿರುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೋ ಅಂಥ ಸಂದರ್ಭಗಳೆಲ್ಲಾ ಅಂದರೇ ಈ ಅಧಿವೇಶನ ನಡೆಯತಕ್ಕ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಸಭಾ ಭವನದ ಸುತ್ತಲೂ ಮತ್ತು ನಡಸ್ಯರು ಉಳಿಯತಕ್ಕ ಜಾಗದಲ್ಲೂ ಹೀಗೆ ಎಲ್ಲೆಲ್ಲಿ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರ ಅಧಿಕಾರವಿರುತ್ತದೋ ಅಂಥ ಕಡೆಗಳೆಲ್ಲಾ ಮಾಮೂ ರಾಗಿ ಹಾಕತಕ್ಕ ಪೋಲೀಸ್ ಸಿಬ್ಬಂದಿಗಿಂತ ಜಾಸ್ತಿ ಜನರನ್ನು ಹಾಕಬೇಕಾಗಿದ್ದರೆ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರ ಅಪ್ಪಣೆಯನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು. ಹಾಗೆ ಅಪ್ಪಣೆಪಡೆಯದೆ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಜನರು ಸೇರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಿಲ್ಲ. ನಾನು ನನ್ನೆಯದಿವನ ತಮ್ಮ ಭೇಂಬರಿಗೆ ಬಂದಿದ್ದಾಗ ನಾನು ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರನ್ನು ಸ್ವನಿಷಿಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಹೀಗೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಜನ ಪೋಲೀಸರನ್ನು ಹಾಕುವುದಕ್ಕೇನಾದರೂ ಸ್ಪಷ್ಟರ ಪರವಾನಿಗೆ ಯನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆಯೇ ಎಂದು ಕೇಳಿದ್ದಕ್ಕೆ ನನಗೆ ಉತ್ತರವೇ ಬರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದರೆ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರ ಅಪ್ಪಣೆ ಯನ್ನು ಪಡೆಯದೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರೇನಾದರೂ ಹೀಗೆ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಲ್ಲಿ ಅದು, ಅಂದರೆ ಅವಶ್ಯಕತೆಗಿಂತಲೂ ಮಿತಿಯಿರಿ ಪೋಲೀಸರನ್ನು ಹಾಕತಕ್ಕದ್ದು ಶಾಸನಾನುಗುಣ್ಯ ವಿರುದ್ಧ, ಸಂಪ್ರದಾಯಕ್ಕೂ ವಿರುದ್ಧ ಮತ್ತು ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರ ಅನುಮತಿಯಿಲ್ಲದೆ ಹಾಕತಕ್ಕದ್ದು ಎಲ್ಲದಕ್ಕಿಂತಲೂ ಅಕ್ಕಮ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ನಾನು ತಮಗೆ ಮನವರಿಕೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಈ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಸಂಪ್ರ ದಾಯಗಳನ್ನು ಮುರಿದಿದ್ದಾರೆ, ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರ ಅಧಿಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಚ್ಯುತಿಯನ್ನು ತಂದಿದ್ದಾರೆ, ಹೀಗೆ ಇವರು ಮಾಡಿರತಕ್ಕದ್ದು ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರ ಗೌರವಕ್ಕೂ ಹಾನಿಯುಂಟಾಗಿದೆ, ನಡಸ್ಯರ ಗೌರವಕ್ಕೂ ಹಾನಿ ಉಂಟಾ ಗಿದೆ. ಇದು ನಮ್ಮೆಲ್ಲರ ಗೌರವಕ್ಕೂ ಧಕ್ಕೆಯನ್ನು ತಂದಿದೆ.

ನಾನೇನೂ ಆ ಶಾಸನಸಭಾ ಭವನದಲ್ಲಿ ಉಳಿದುಕೊಂಡಿಲ್ಲ. ನಾನು ನನ್ನ ಮನೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಉಳಿದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೇನೆ ನಾನು ಶಾಸನಸಭಾ ನಡಸ್ಯರು ಉಳಿದಿದ್ದ ಜಾಗಕ್ಕೆ ಬಂದಾಗ ಅಲ್ಲಿ ನಾನು ಕಂಡ ದೃಶ್ಯ ಹೀಗಿತ್ತು. ನಾನು ಹಿಂದೆ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಾಗಿದ್ದಾಗ ಈಗ ಮುಖ್ಯಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಾಗಿರತಕ್ಕವರ ಮೇಲೆ ಸಿ.ಐ.ಡಿ. ಗಳನ್ನು ಹಾಕಿದ್ದೆ ಎಂಬುದಾಗಿ ಅವರು ಈ ಆಶೆಯಿಲ್ಲದೆ ನನ್ನ ಮೇಲೆ ಆರೋಪಣೆ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆ ಒಂದು ಆಶೆಯನ್ನು ಅವರು ಮನಸ್ಸಿನಲ್ಲಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡೋ ಏನೋ ಇವರಿಗೆ ನನ್ನ ಮೇಲೆ ಸಿ.ಐ.ಡಿ. ಗಳನ್ನು ಹಾಕುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಹೊರಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆದರೆ ನಾನೇ ಒಬ್ಬ ದೊಡ್ಡ ಸಿ.ಐ.ಡಿ. ಅಗಿ ರುವಾಗ ಇವರಿಗೆ ನನ್ನ ಮೇಲೆ ಸಿ.ಐ.ಡಿ. ಗಳನ್ನು ಹಾಕಲು ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿದೆ? ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ಎ. ಕೃಷ್ಣಪ್ಪ ನವರೂ ಕೂಡ ಅವರಮೇಲೆ ಸಿ.ಐ.ಡಿ. ಹಾಕಿದ್ದರು ಎಂತ ಅಪಾದನೆ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದೇನೇ ಇರಲಿ. ನಾನು ತಮ್ಮೆಲ್ಲ ಆರಿಕೆಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಿಷ್ಟೆ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು ಹೀಗೆ ಅವಶ್ಯಕತೆಗಿಂತಲೂ ಮಿತಿಯಿರಿ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಜನ ಪೋಲೀಸರನ್ನು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ನೇಮಕಮಾಡಿದ್ದು ರೂಲ್‌ಗೆ ವಿರುದ್ಧವಾಗಿದೆಯೆಂದು ಹೇಗೆ ಹೇಳು

ತ್ತೀರೆಂದು ನನ್ನನ್ನು ಅವರು ಕೇಳಿರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ನಾನು ಹೇಳುವುದಿಷ್ಟೆ; ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಜನ ಪೋಲೀಸರ ಅಗತ್ಯವಿದೆಯೆಂದು ಬರೆಯದೇನೆ ಇದ್ದಾಗ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಜನ ಪೋಲೀಸರನ್ನು ಹಾಕುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಹೇಗೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿದೆ? ಹಲವಾರು ದಶಕಗಳಿಂದ ಬಂದಿದ್ದ ಸಾಂಪ್ರದಾಯಗಳನ್ನೂ ಸಹಾ ಮುರಿದಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದುದರಿಂದ ಇದು ಕಾನೂನಿಗೆ ವಿರುದ್ಧವಾದ್ದು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಅದರೆ ಆ ದಿವಸ ಅಲ್ಲಿ ನಾನು ಹೇಳುವಂತೆ ಅಗತ್ಯಕ್ಕಿಂತ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಜನ ಪೋಲೀಸರು ಅಲ್ಲಿದ್ದರೇ—ಇಲ್ಲವೇ ಎಂಬುದು ರಾಜಕೀಯ ವಿಷಯ.

ಒಬ್ಬ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು.—ನಾಪೂ ಆ ರೆಜಿಸ್ಟ್ರೇಟರ್ ಹೋಂನಲ್ಲೇ ಉಳಿದಿದ್ದೇವೆ, ಅಲ್ಲಿ ನಮಗೇನೂ ತೊಂದರೆಯಿಲ್ಲ, ಸುಖವಾಗಿದ್ದೇವಲ್ಲಾ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಎಂ. ಜೆನ್ನಬಸಪ್ಪ.—ಇಷ್ಟೊಂದು ಜನ ಸದಸ್ಯರೇನು ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರ ಕಡೆಗೆ ಬರೆದು ಈಗಾಗಲೇ ಅವು ಅವರ ಹಸ್ತಗತವಾಗಿವೆಯೋ ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಿರುವಂತೆ, ಈ ಶಾಸನ ಸಭೆಯ ಹಾಗೂ ಎರ್ಟ್ಲಿ ಶಾಸನಸಭಾ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ತಂಗಿದ್ದಾರೋ ಆ ಕಟ್ಟಡಗಳ ಸುತ್ತಮುತ್ತ ಅವಶ್ಯಕತೆಗಿಂತಲೂ ಮೀರಿ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಜನ ಪೋಲೀಸರನ್ನು ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರ ಅಪ್ಪಣೆಯಿಲ್ಲದೆ ಹಾಕಿರತಕ್ಕದ್ದು ಇಲ್ಲಿರತಕ್ಕ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಸದಸ್ಯರ ಗೌರವಕ್ಕೂ ಮತ್ತು ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರ ಗೌರವಕ್ಕೂ ಕುಂದನ್ನು ತರತಕ್ಕದ್ದಾಗಿದೆ.

ಎರಡನೆಯದು ಮಾನ್ಯ ಗೃಹಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ನನ್ನ ಅಪ್ಪ ಸ್ನೇಹಿತರು. ನನಗೆ ಬಹಳ ವ್ಯಸನವಾಯಿತು. “ಬೆಂಕಿ ಹಚ್ಚಿದವರು ನೀವು,” ಎಂದರು. ನಿಜವಾಗಿಯೂ ಈ ಮಾತು ಸಭೆಗೆ ಅಗೌರವ ಉಂಟುಮಾಡಿದೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಅದನ್ನು ಈಗ ರಿಕಾರ್ಡ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ನೋಡಿಸೋಣವಾಗಲಿ “ಬೆಂಕಿ ಹಚ್ಚಿದವರು ನೀವು,” ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದನ್ನು ವಾಪಸ್ಸು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು, ಕ್ಷಮಾಪಣೆ ಕೇಳಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು. ಅವರು ಅದನ್ನು ವಾಪಸ್ಸು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳದೇ ಇದ್ದರೆ ಎನ್‌ಫೋರ್ಸ್ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗಿ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ಇಲ್ಲದಿದ್ದರೆ ಮುಂದಿನ ಕ್ರಮ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇವೆ. ನಮ್ಮ ಗೃಹ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಬಹಳ ಸೌಜನ್ಯ ಇದೆ ಅದರೆ ಅವರು ಈ ಕಡೆಗೆ ಕೈತೋರಿಸಿ ಶಿವಪ್ಪನವರಿಗೆ ಒಬ್ಬರಿಗೆ ಹೇಳಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಈ ಬೆಂಚಿಗೆ ಎಲ್ಲಕ್ಕೂ ಅನ್ವಯವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಅವರು ಇಷ್ಟೊಂದು ಜವಾಬ್ದಾರಿ ಹೊತ್ತುಕೊಂಡು ಈ ಮಾತು ಅಡಿರತಕ್ಕದ್ದು ಸರಿಯೇ? ಅದು ನಮ್ಮ ನಿಮ್ಮ ಗೌರವಕ್ಕೆ ಕುಂದುಕ ಬರುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೇ ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ಪರಿಶೀಲಿಸಿ ಮಾಡಿ. ಅಗೌರವಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಕ್ಷಮಾಪಣೆ ಬೇಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರೆ ಅದು ಸೌಜನ್ಯವಾದ ಮಾತೇ? ಇದು ನಾವು ನೀವು ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಯೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Some Hon'ble members get up and speak and some speak while sitting, and some others go on commenting with the result things will become confused and my old ears are not able to grasp immediately what has been stated by all. So whatever that has been stated by the members will have to be thought over and examined. I will do this after Tea break. Now the House stands adjourned for half-an-hour.

The House adjourned for Recess at Three of the Clock and reassembled at Thirty minutes past Three of the Clock.

(Mr. SPEAKER in the Chair)

Mr. SPEAKER.—The hon'ble member Sri H. Siddaveerappa wanted me to give a ruling with regard the word “lie”. I do not think I am wrong because I have given a ruling in this House on a prior occasion. I believe it has been held that the word “lie” is unparliamentary and if one remembers the magnificent rendering of it by Mr. Winston Churchill as terminological inexactitude.....

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—You may please reserve the ruling. On 8th June it is stated in the House of Commons by the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs while taking part in the discussion about some dispute going on.

Mr. SPEAKER.—It is not a ruling. But the member is quoting a review of the B. B. C.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—It is published in inverted commas from the Information Bulletin issued by the High Commissioner for U.K. in New Delhi.

Mr. SPEAKER.—But, so far as our legislature is concerned and even in the Parliament uptil now, I am not aware of one referring to this.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—I would request you to kindly read the bulletin and see what can be done because we draw our inspiration from the May's Parliamentary Practice. It is just like “ಬೀಜಮಂತ್ರ” so far as parliamentary practices are concerned.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I am quoting from the Handards Nos. 498, 660, 505 1338 297. Almost every country has ruled like that. But Now I will examine and give a ruling later on.

RULING OF THE SPEAKER ABOUT THE POLICE ARRANGEMENTS

Mr. SPEAKER.—Now with regard to the ruling on the point of order raised by the hon'ble member Sri S. Channiah I am giving the ruling. The hon'ble member Sri S. Channiah raised a point of order saying that the presence of the police is causing embarrassment and therefore it amounts to a breach of privilege or some other interference. The point of order has always to relate to the position arising inside the House in the course of the Debate. When deliberations in the House are taking place if there is breach of the order or breach of convention or breach of constitutional provisions, then the House is stated to be not in order and that is raised by way of a point of order. Having given anxious consideration to what Sri S. Channiah stated I have not been able to know any rule which has been violated.

The hon'ble member Sri H. M. Channabasappa referred to certain convention. The convention he had in mind is the one relating to the presence of the police in the legislators' Home or in residential quarters provided by the Government. That will be on a different footing altogether. I will see into it after gathering more facts and knowing what exactly happened. So far as the privilege is concerned, the privilege is with regard to the deliberations that are to take place inside the House and by way of further protection and extension of privilege. The area covered in which privilege is to prevail, has been extended to